UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,295	07/29/2003	Douglas Carl Bacon	132843	6494

7590   07/10/2008

John S. Beulick
Armstrong Teasdale LLP
Suite 2600
One Metropolitan Square
St. Louis, MO 63102

EXAMINER
JOSEPH, TONYA S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3628	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/10/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/629,295	BACON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TONYA JOSEPH	3628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 March 2008*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☐ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) *1-9* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *10-27* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

Claims 10-27 have been previously examined. Claims 10 and 19 have been amended.

No Claims have been cancelled. No claims have been added. Thus claims 10-27 are

again presented for Examination.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10-27 have been considered but are moot

in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 10, 13-14, 17-19, 22-23 and 26-27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Gonyea et al. U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2001/0032109

A1 in view of Joao U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2002/0016655 in further view of

Uegaki U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2002/0161533 A1.

3.   As per Claim 10, Gonyea teaches a client system (see para. 13 lines 1-6, para.

14 lines 1-5 and Fig. 1; a centralized database for storing information (see para. 13 lines

13-17 and Fig. 1); a server system configured to be coupled to said client system and

said database said server system (see para. 13 lines 6-17, para. 19 lines 1-4 and Fig. 1)

further configured to:

 receive, at the database, component operational history data and component

inspection data from a user for a pre-identified component (see para. 46 lines 6-8 and

para. 31 lines 6-10, para. 21 lines 1-13 and para. 26 lines 8-10);

receive, at the database, cost comprising at least one of: component replacement part

costs, component part repair costs, and vendor service costs, the cost are associated

with the pre-identified component (see para. 22 lines 8-13 and para. 44); prompt a user

to input a pre-determined component operational forecast into the database (see para.

26 lines 6-10 and Fig. 5);

analyze component maintenance information including component inspection data (see

para. 27 lines 10-34; para. 31 lines 6-10 and para. 32-34) and at least one of

component operational history data, customer expectation of contingency fees and

service prices, replacement part costs, part repair costs, vendor service costs, and

component operational forecast (see para. 27 lines 9-26); and

automatically generate a financial report including at least one schedule

of component maintenance events and costs associated with each event based on the

component maintenance information analysis (see para. 24 lines 12-20). Gonyea does

not explicitly teach the method taught by Joao, receive at a database, a customer

expectation of contingency fees and service prices (see para. 336-338 and 344). It

would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to modify the system of Gonyea to include the teachings of Joao to

communicate a user's request for service, as taught in Joao para. 336. Gonyea does

not explicitly teach the system taught by Uegaki cost are determined using pre-stored

costs related to the pre-identified component (see para. 13-14 and para. 49). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the systems of Gonyea and Joao to include the teachings of Uegaki to determine ranking levels for parts inventory and provide users with more part options for their estimate as taught by Uegaki para. 50.

4.   As per Claim 13, Gonyea in view of Joao in further view of Uegaki teaches the system of claim 10 as described above. Gonyea further teaches, said server system is configured to compute a schedule for maintenance events based on at least one of estimated life of replacement parts, estimated life of repaired parts, component operational history, component operational forecast and a predetermined maintenance event interval (see para. 27 lines 9-16 and para. 31).

5.   As per Claim 14, Gonyea in view of Joao in further view of Uegaki teaches the system of claim 13 as described above. Gonyea further teaches said server system is configured to determine a part repair cycle (see para. 27 lines 27-37).

6.   As per Claim 17, Gonyea in view of Joao in further view of Uegaki teaches the system of claim 10 as described above. Gonyea further teaches remove selected parts from an inventory (see para. 55 lines 2-7 and para. 56 lines 5-9); repair the component using the selected parts (see para. 57 lines 1-5); automatically orders replacement parts for purchase (see para. 57 lines 11-12) and replenish the inventory using the replacement parts (see para. 57 lines 12-14). Gonyea does not explicitly teach said server system is configured to: automatically compute a projected rotation of component parts through a fleet of components. However, Gonyea discloses an automatic

computation of a projected rotation of component parts through a component (see para. 55, 56 and 57). Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Gonyea to include automatically compute a projected rotation of component parts through a fleet of components in order to accomplish the desired effect for multiple components.

7.   As per Claim 18, Gonyea in view of Joao in further view of Uegaki teaches the system of claim 10 as described above. Gonyea further teaches said server system is configured to automatically compute the financial charges accrued during the maintenance event using the component replacement part costs, the component part repair costs, and the vendor service costs associated with the maintenance event (see para. 24 lines 12-20 and para. 22 lines 8-13).

8.   As per Claim 19, Gonyea teaches, a computer program embodied on a computer readable medium for maintaining at least one component, said program comprising a code segment that receives, at a database, component operational history data and component inspection data from a user for a pre-identified component and (see para. 60 and para. 46 lines 6-8 and para. 31 lines 6-10):

receive, at the database, cost comprising at least one of: component replacement part costs, component part repair costs, and vendor service costs, the cost are associated with the pre-identified component (see para. 22 lines 8-13 and para. 44);

prompts a user to input a pre-determined component operational forecast into the database (see para. 26 lines 6-10 and Fig. 5);

analyzes component maintenance information including component inspection data

(see para. 27 lines 10-34; para. 31 lines 6-10 and para. 32-34) and at least one of

component operational history data, replacement part costs, part repair costs, vendor

service costs, and component operational forecast (see para. 27 lines 9-26);

automatically generates a financial report including at least one schedule of component

maintenance events and costs associated with each event based on the component

maintenance information analysis (see para. 60 and para. 24 lines 12-20). Gonyea does

not explicitly teach the method taught by Joao, receive at a database, a customer

expectation of contingency fees and service prices (see para. 336-338 and 344). It

would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to modify the system of Gonyea to include the teachings of Joao to

communicate a user's request for service, as taught in Joao para. 336. Gonyea does

not explicitly teach the system taught by Uegaki cost are determined using pre-stored

costs related to the pre-identified component (see para. 13-14 and para. 49). It would

have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention

to modify the system of Gonyea and Joao to include the teachings of Uegaki to

determine ranking levels for parts inventory and provide users with more part options for

their estimate as taught by Uegaki para. 50.

9.   As per Claim 22, Gonyea in view of Joao in further view of Uegaki teaches the

computer readable medium of claim 19 as described above. Gonyea further teaches

said program comprising a code segment that computes a schedule for maintenance

events based on at least one of estimated life of replacement parts, estimated life of

repaired parts, component operational history, component operational forecast and predetermined maintenance event interval (see para. 60 and para. 27 lines 9-16 and para. 31).

10.   As per Claim 23, Gonyea in view of Joao in further view of Uegaki teaches the computer readable medium of claim 22 as described above. Gonyea further teaches said program comprising a code segment that determines a part repair cycle (see para. 60 and para. 27 lines 27-37).

11.   As per Claim 26, Gonyea in view of Joao in further view of Uegaki teaches the computer readable medium of claim 19. Gonyea further teaches said program comprising a code segment that (see para. 60); removes selected parts from an inventory (see para. 55 lines 2-7 and para. 56 lines 5-9); repairs the component using the selected parts (see para. 57 lines 1-5); automatically orders replacement parts for purchase (see para. 57 lines 11-12); and replenishes the inventory using the replacement parts (see para. 57 lines 12-14). Gonyea does not explicitly teach said server system is configured to: automatically compute a projected rotation of component parts through a fleet of components. However, Gonyea discloses an automatic computation of a projected rotation of component parts through a component (see para. 55, 56 and 57). Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Gonyea to include automatically compute a projected rotation of component parts through a fleet of components in order to accomplish the desired effect for multiple components.

12.   As per Claim 27, Gonyea in view of Joao in further view of Uegaki teaches the computer readable medium of claim 19 as described above. Gonyea further teaches said server system is configured to automatically compute the financial charges accrued during the maintenance event using the component replacement part costs, the component part repair costs, and the vendor service costs associated with the maintenance event (see para. 60 and para. 24 lines 12-20 and para. 22 lines 8-13).

13.   Claims 11 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gonyea et al. U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2001/0032109 A1 in view Joao U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2002/0016655 in further view of Uegaki U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2002/0161533 A1 and McQuown et al. U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2002/20059269 A1.

14.   As per Claim 11, Gonyea in view of Joao in further view of Uegaki teaches the system of claim 10 as described above. Gonyea further teaches said server system is configured to receive component replacement part costs, component part repair costs, and vendor service costs associated with the identified component from an on-line catalog selected based on the component identification (see para. 17 lines 4-7; para. 19 lines 4-9; para. 22 lines 3-13 and para. 44, Examiner is interpreting a listed item on the parts list as an identified component. Examiner is further interpreting an online database having lists and files relating to parts list detail as an online catalog). Gonyea does not explicitly teach the system taught by McQuown, the online catalog comprising pre-stored data for a plurality of pre-identified components (see para. 44 and 46). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention

to modify the systems of Gonyea, Joao and Uegaki to include the teachings of

McQuown to allow for direct parts ordering for inventory in a specific repair, as taught by

McQuown para. 46.

15.   As per Claim 20, Gonyea in view of Joao in further view of Uegaki teaches the

computer readable medium of claim 19 as described above. Gonyea further teaches

said program comprising a code segment that receives component replacement part

costs, component part repair costs, and vendor service costs associated with the

identified component from an on-line catalog selected based on the component

identification (see para. 60 and see para. 17 lines 4-7; para.19 lines 4-9; para. 22 lines

3-13 and para. 44, Examiner is interpreting a listed item on the parts list as an identified

component.. Examiner is further interpreting an online database having lists and files

relating to parts list detail as an online catalog). Gonyea does not explicitly teach the

system taught by McQuown, the online catalog comprising pre-stored data for a plurality

of pre-identified components (see para. 44 and 46). It would have been prima facie

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the systems

of Gonyea, Joao and Uegaki to include the teachings of McQuown to allow for direct

parts ordering for inventory in a specific repair, as taught by McQuown para. 46.

16.   Claims 12 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by

Gonyea et al. U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2001/0032109 A1 in view of in view of

Joao U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2002/0016655 in further view of Uegaki U.S. Pre-

Grant Publication No. 2002/0161533 and Herz et al. U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No.

2001/0014868 A1 and Tsunoda et al. JP 2002149861.

17.   As per Claim 12, Gonyea teaches the system of claim 10 as described above. Gonyea further teaches said server system is configured to: determine component maintenance event contingency fees (see para. 24 lines 12-20, Examiner is interpreting service costs as contingency fees); Gonyea does not explicitly teach, determine customer cost discount level for replacement parts and vendor fees. Herz teaches determine customer cost discount level for vendor fees (see para. 279 lines 1-10). Tsunoda teaches discloses determine customer cost discount level for replacement parts (see the Solution of Tsunoda lines 15-18). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the systems of Gonyea, Joao and Uegaki to include determining customer cost discount level for replacement parts and vendor fees in order to provide an incentive to a client to use the services of a vendor.

18.   As per Claim 21, Gonyea teaches the computer readable medium of claim 19 as described above. Gonyea further teaches said program comprising a code segment that: determines component maintenance event contingency fees (see para. 60 and para. 24 lines 12-20; Examiner is interpreting service costs as contingency fees); Gonyea does not explicitly teach, determine customer cost discount level for replacement parts and vendor fees. Herz teaches determine customer cost discount level for vendor fees (see para. 279 lines 1-10). Tsunoda teaches discloses determine customer cost discount level for replacement parts (see the Solution of Tsunoda lines 15-18). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the systems of Gonyea, Joao and Uegaki to include

determining customer cost discount level for replacement parts and vendor fees in order to provide an incentive to a client to use the services of a vendor.

19.   Claims 15-16, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Gonyea et al. U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2001/0032109 A1 in view of in view of Joao U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2002/0016655 in further view of Uegaki U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2002/0161533 and Official Notice.

20.   As per Claim 15, Gonyea teaches the system of claim 10 as described above. Gonyea further teaches an age of a plurality of parts installed in a component (see para. 20 lines 6-9 and lines 3-5) an age of the component parts in inventory (see para. 27 lines 9-14, Examiner is interpreting a part that has been removed from a component, repaired and then returned to inventory as having a known age). Gonyea does not explicitly teach a user being prompted to input age of a plurality of parts installer in a component and an age of the component parts in inventory. Official Notice is taken that prompting a user to enter data is old and well known in the art of database management. It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the systems of Gonyea, Joao and Uegaki to include prompting a user to input an age of a plurality of parts installer in a component and an age of the component parts in inventory in order enable a user to keep an accurate record of costs and expenditures. Gonyea further teaches, determines, from the schedule of maintenance events, the age of each of the plurality of installed parts and the age of each of the plurality of inventory parts at each maintenance event (see para. 27 lines 9-22 and para. 57 lines 4-9); and displays an identification of each part whose

age at each scheduled maintenance event exceeds a pre-determined age (see para. 27 lines 27-37 and para. 28 lines 13-21).

21.   As per Claim 16, Gonyea in view of Joao in further view of Uegaki and Official Notice teaches the system of claim 15 as described above. Gonyea further teaches access a predetermined on-line catalog, the catalog including new parts costs and parts repair costs and part expected life (see para. 17 lines 4-7 and para. 19 lines 5-9, para. 22 lines 8-13; para. 24 lines 6-10; para. 27 lines 5-7 and para. 28 lines 5-12, Examiner is interpreting the accessing of an online catalog and corresponding parts information to be based on the exact maintenance event as described in para. 28 lines 6-10), Gonyea does not explicitly teach accessing a predetermined on-line catalog using the frame size and combustion type.

However, these differences are only found to be non-functional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The accessing of the identified data would be the same regardless of the type of identification used to find it. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F. 2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404, (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F. 3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Gonyea further teaches recommend an inspection interval and an estimate of remaining parts life (see para. 35 lines 9-10 and para. 27 lines 4-7, Examiner is interpreting the recommendation to be based on contract information as described in para. 31 lines 6-10) Gonyea does not explicitly teach recommending an inspection interval and an

estimate of remaining parts life based on the inputted gas component frame size and combustion type.

However, these differences are only found to be non-functional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The recommended inspection interval and the estimate of remaining parts life would be the same regardless of the type of identification used to find the already computed information. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F. 2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404, (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F. 3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

22.   As per Claim 24, Gonyea in view of Uegaki, the computer readable medium of claim 19 as described above. Gonyea further teaches said program comprising a code segment that: an age of a plurality of parts installed in the component (see para. 20 lines 6-9 and lines 3-5); an age of the component parts in inventory (see para. 27 lines 9-14, Examiner is interpreting a part that has been removed from a component, repaired and then returned to inventory as having a known age); Gonyea does not explicitly teach a user being prompted to input this data. Official Notice is taken that prompting a user to enter data is old and well known in the art of database management. It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the systems of Gonyea, Joao and Uegaki to include prompting a user to input an age of a plurality of parts installer in a component and an age of the component parts in inventory in order to keep an accurate record of costs and expenditures. Gonyea further teaches determines, from the schedule of maintenance events, the age of each

of the plurality of installed parts and the age of each of the plurality of inventory parts at each maintenance event (see para. 27 lines 9-22 and para. 57 lines 4-9); and displays an identification of each part whose age at each scheduled maintenance event exceeds a pre-determined age (see para. 27 lines 27-37 and para. 28 lines 13-21).

23.   As per Claim 25, Gonyea in view Uegaki in further view of Official Notice teaches the computer readable medium of claim 24 as described above. Gonyea further teaches said program comprising a code segment (see para. 60): access a predetermined on-line catalog, the catalog including new parts costs and parts repair costs and part expected life (see para. 17 lines 4-7 and para. 19 lines 5-9, para. 22 lines 8-13; para. 24 lines 6-10; para. 27 lines 5-7 and para. 28 lines 5-12, Examiner is interpreting the accessing of an online catalog and corresponding parts information to be based on the exact maintenance event as described in para. 28 lines 6-10), Gonyea does not explicitly teach accessing a predetermined on-line catalog using the frame size and combustion type.

However, these differences are only found to be non-functional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The accessing of the identified data would be the same regardless of the type of identification used to find it. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F. 2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404, (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F. 3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Gonyea further teaches recommend an inspection interval and an estimate of remaining parts life (see para. 35 lines 9-10 and para. 27 lines 4-7, Examiner is interpreting the

recommendation to be based on contract information as described in para. 31 lines 6-

10) Gonyea does not explicitly teach recommending an inspection interval and an

estimate of remaining parts life based on the inputted gas component frame size and

combustion type.

However, these differences are only found to be non-functional descriptive material and

are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The recommended inspection interval

and the estimate of remaining parts life would be the same regardless of the type of

identification used to find the already computed information. Thus, this descriptive

material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of

patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F. 2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404, (Fed. Cir.

1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F. 3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Conclusion

24.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TONYA JOSEPH whose telephone number is (571)270-1361. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30am-5:00pm First Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Hayes can be reached on 571 272 0847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tonya Joseph
Examiner
Art Unit 3628

/JOHN W HAYES/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3628